Troy J. Wade Chairman Louisa District

Willie L. Gentry, Jr. Cuckoo District

Fitzgerald A. Barnes Patrick Henry District

Duane A. AdamsMineral District



County of Louisa

Post Office Box 160 Louisa, Virginia 23093 (540) 967-3400 (540) 967-3411 Fax R.T. Williams, Jr. Vice Chairman Jackson District

Tommy J. Barlow Mountain Road District

Robert F. Babyok, Jr. Green Springs District

Christian R. Goodwin County Administrator

September 17, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, District of Columbia 20554

RE: Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment, WC Docket No. 17-84; Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment, WT Docket No. 17-79

Dear Ms. Dortch,

The County of Louisa writes to express its concerns about the Federal Communications Commission's proposed Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order regarding state and local governance of small cell wireless infrastructure deployment. Louisa County is a rural community with areas that have somewhat limited wireless coverage; and therefore is generally supportive of infrastructure development when conducted under a reasonable amount of oversite.

We appreciate the Commission's efforts to engage with local governments on this issue and share the Commission's goal of ensuring the growth of cutting-edge broadband services for all Americans. However, we remain deeply concerned about several provisions of this proposal especially the preemption measures which compromise our traditional authority and expose us to unnecessary liability.

- The FCC's proposed new collocation shot clock category is too extreme. The proposal designates any preexisting structure, regardless of its structural design or suitability for attaching wireless equipment, as eligible for this new expedited 60 day shot clock. When paired with the FCC's previous decision exempting small wireless facilities from federal historic and environmental review, this places an unreasonable burden on local governments to prevent historic preservation, environmental, or safety harms to the
- community. The addition of up to three cubic feet of antenna and 28 cubic feet of additional equipment to a structure not originally designed to carry that equipment is substantial and may necessitate more

review than the FCC has allowed in its proposal. Additionally a 90 day shot clock for new structures further restricts the localities ability to perform an adequate review. This may inadvertently require the locality to change or circumvent the development review process put in place to protect the health, safety and welfare of its citizens.

- The FCC's proposed definition of "effective prohibition" is overly broad. The draft report and order proposes a definition of "effective prohibition" that invites challenges to long-standing local rights of way requirements unless they meet a subjective and unclear set of guidelines. While the Commission may have intended to preserve local review, this framing and definition of effective prohibition opens local governments to the likelihood of more, not less, conflict and litigation over requirements for aesthetics, spacing, and undergrounding.
- The FCC's proposed recurring fee structure is an unreasonable overreach that will harm local policy innovation. We disagree with the FCC's interpretation of "fair and reasonable compensation" as meaning approximately \$270 per small cell site. Local governments share the federal government's goal of ensuring affordable broadband access for every American, regardless of their income level or address. That is why many counties, cities and towns have worked to negotiate fair deals with wireless providers, which may exceed that number or provide additional benefits to the community. Additionally, the Commission has moved away from rate regulation in recent years. Why does it see fit to dictate such narrow rates charged by local governments? Many smaller or more rural localities, such as Louisa County, use third party professionals to review the structural and technical aspects of applications. This interpretation will likely place an additional financial burden onto such localities that do not have the resources to absorb the additional cost.

Our county continues to partner with private business to build the best broadband infrastructure possible for our residents without curtailing innovation. Therefore, we strongly oppose this effort to restrict local authority and stymie local innovation, while limiting the obligations providers have to our community. We urge you to oppose the proposed Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order.

Respectfully submitted,

Froy J. Wade, Chairman Board of Supervisors

Louisa County, Virginia